URGE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR:
VIRGINIA INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCE/WILLIAM & MARY

This plan is designed to set a pathway forward to incorporate prior URGE deliverables into VIMS, the W&M Geology Department, and the W&M-VIMS Marine Science Minor. This is meant to maintain and build momentum as we continue to develop, assess, and finalize policies and resources developed during the course of URGE participation in Spring 2021, a task that will continue into Summer 2021 and beyond.

POD AGREEMENT: revisit this and consider whether we’ve accomplished what we set out to do, and note below what next steps are to ensure we do reach these aspirational objectives over the coming weeks, months, and years.

- Institutional accountability should be one of the top priorities
- Present recommendations with full faculty, staff, and student support to upper administration to express “this is what we want to see from our institution.”
- Identify responsible parties with the capacity to make changes
- Make personal and group education on JEDI issues a priority, including consistent updates to our tool kit/vocabulary.
- Continually invite people of diverse backgrounds (including international scientists) to the discussion. Find ways to engage those within our institute who are not currently active in JEDI initiatives.
- Create a mechanism (e.g., speaker series) to seek wisdom and ideas from other groups/individuals.
- Add JEDI to faculty and staff annual evaluations (e.g. in faculty goals and assessment)

POD GUIDELINES/NORMS: consider how these can be adapted to smaller lab/department/unit settings

- Develop lab group/unit norms collectively. Revisit and revise the norms whenever a new person enters the lab group or unit or at minimum each year.
- Meet with individual project groups to discuss, add to and review guidelines
  - Require leaders of each project to upload them
- JEDI will need to be a constant core philosophy also as an ongoing project. Thus time, effort and energy are needed to invest in this philosophy.
- Value other currencies of knowledge in collaborations.

COMPLAINTS & REPORTING POLICY: we presented a number of outstanding links to a somewhat byzantine set of online policies for complaints and reporting. Revisit this deliverable and summarize below changes that can be implemented at the unit or institutional level (and identify responsible parties) to improve policies, or their accessibility.

- Make policies and reporting easier to find and access. Include this information in orientation.
- Create a culture of reporting - create lab wide reporting options as well as institutional wide
- Explicitly create reporting for racial harassment
- Compile policies into a centralized location or webpage
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA: Clearly much work remains in achieving the diversity variable of the JEDI equation; some of that is due to structural problems, and some institutional. There are also issues to work through on how demographic data can be collected and made public, requiring work with HR and administration on accountability. Consider what next steps can be to address some of the issues identified, and how we can better articulate, publicize, and hold ourselves accountable to our demographic diversity goals.

- Hold W&M/VIMS accountable and comparable to other schools by publicly displaying information about W&M/VIMS demographics and comparable schools on the W&M/VIMS website (Student Diversity Dashboard)
  - Create (or if they exist, make public) specific actionable goals for diversity rather than “hire/admit more BIPOC individuals”. Also follow up with results.
  - Create annual meetings (or other schedule) of W&M/VIMS leadership team to review the trends (are we meeting our goals, etc) and identify specific actions to make progress towards goals in the next time period
- The session 8 paper suggested documenting not only total numbers but incoming student interest, declared major and graduation rates from departments/schools/programs. How much of this is data that exists and just needs to be made available?
- Record demographic information from speakers within the department and school, include career status (e.g., early career, etc.)
  - How would this be collected? Ask speakers to self-identify? (Potentially, anonymous submission that is collated and reviewed every 2 years to help protect privacy?)
- Track recruitment and retention over time

POLICIES FOR WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES OF COLOR: what are the next steps to improve acknowledgement of, interactions with, and policies for working with communities of color at each the lab/unit and department/institutional level? Review section VI of our Session #4 Deliverable and consider here next steps and timelines for implementation of recommendations.

- Consider providing guidance for using the W&M land acknowledgement and sharing its existence
- Develop a VIMS land acknowledgement and provide guidance for its use
- Work with K-12 focusing on URMs in Gloucester, Williamsburg-James City County - need Geology as a required class
- Provide informational sessions or training for how relationships can be cultivated and maintained
  - focus on PIs in the grant writing process, but also consider graduate students as a part of training to eventually hold similar roles
- Require final presentations once research has concluded
- Create a living resource that provides information on communities that are already involved in regional research and/or are already working with research labs
- Keep this data accessible to researchers and the public.

ADMISSIONS & HIRING POLICIES: consider how recommendations can be (1) implemented; and (2) adapted to lab/department/unit settings. What changes can be made immediately to hiring and undergraduate/graduate admissions processes, and what can be done in the next 1-2 years? What may require longer-term effort and how do we push for those changes?

- Faculty searches that don’t have BIPOC applicants should be considered failed searches that need to be re-evaluated and expanded upon beyond the narrow qualifications
• Demographics of student applicants should be evaluated at each step of the admissions process
• More targeted recruitment from underrepresented communities should be funded/supported
• Host diverse faculty search committees (including individuals outside VIMS if need be until we hire more BIPOC faculty)
• Revised admissions criteria to remove certain metrics such as GRE, minimum GPA requirement, etc.
• Include commitment to DEI work in hiring rubric (i.e. diversity statement) and in tenure review process.
  o This requires a systemic shift to value DEI work as equally important as research requirements for Tenure.
• Be proactive: seek out BIPOC candidates and invite them to apply
• Have a results based review of candidates diversity statement. Need to check their diversity statement is actionable and supported by past conduct.

SAFETY PLANS: what are some of the tools and techniques we as URGE participants can use to push for development and implementation of safety plans within our own labs or departments, or with class instructors?

• Safety plans should be developed that do not punish the person who does not feel safe. If someone doesn’t feel safe in any particular situation, they should not be made to feel guilty for exercising their right to safety
  o This should be part of a code of conduct that each department, administrative group, or lab is required to make/have
• Could we develop a “best practices” document for safety plans like the one that was developed for incorporating DEI into classes? Faculty may be more likely to work on developing plans if they already have a guide or example.
• All graduate students and all students, staff, and faculty, in general should receive a mandatory field safety training that should be repeated yearly
  o That includes a section about discriminatory safety issues
  o Also, maybe similar to the Covid field safety protocols, PI’s should submit a similar plan for each project about the cultural/historical context of the area, for international work any laws that people need to be aware of, and what steps they are taking to address those issues prior to and during the work to keep their group safe - this could also include a check-list of supplies a researcher will need for their trip that is signed by the members going out into the field to show that everyone is aware of the safety protocols and items needed
    ▪ This should also include an anonymous Google or qualtrics form for participants to report on how the trip went, so that people feel comfortable reporting any issues that may have come up (yes we all hate more paperwork, but accountability is necessary!)
• A field gear “library” should be developed with purchased or donated gear to support students without resources to personally purchase field gear
  o This should also include any identifying t-shirts or car magnets with the VIMS logo that can be checked out if researchers/advisory members want them (should be paid for by VIMS admin)
  o Similarly, online there should be an official letter of support that researchers can print out with signatures from the W&M president and VIMS dean for official record
**RESOURCE MAPS:** what is the best approach for a “resource map” at VIMS/W&M? Is one needed? Arguably many of the resources exist, but all are disparate. What would be the best home for one? Maybe an overarching institutional map, and then lab/dept/unit-specific supplemental components?

- Individual resource maps/flowcharts summarizing resources/providing links at W&M and VIMS.
  - Can be posted as “flyers” and on institutional webpages [i.e. with QR codes to link physical flyers to digital resources]
  - Could be included in orientation
  - Links provided in yearly or seasonal communications (i.e. highlighted in the Digest)
  - Could be helpful to survey the community to see what resources we either don’t have, or that we do but isn’t known/advertised widely enough
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Initial Point of Contact(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Review / Update Interval</th>
<th>Racial Risk Assessment Needed?</th>
<th>Training Recommended?</th>
<th>Approval, Check, and/or Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints and Reporting Policy</td>
<td>Update accessibility: these resources are difficult to find. Update to include explicit policies and reporting procedures for racial harassment.</td>
<td>Dive-In Ombuds Office of Compliance and Equity (Pamela Mason) Dean of Students Office</td>
<td>Discrimination, Harassment &amp; Retaliation Policy Resources for Reporting</td>
<td>every 3 years? recommend more often (every year)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Mandatory training is provided to those responsible: Obuds, mandatory reporters, etc</td>
<td>VIMS and William &amp; Mary administration; the chain on this already goes very high at both institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Data</td>
<td>Requires review/updating</td>
<td>For VIMS students: Associate Dean of Academic Studies at VIMS</td>
<td>Class of 2024 Student Demographic Data Staff Demographic Data</td>
<td>Review every 2 years</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>unconscious bias in hiring training</td>
<td>None; would require additional buy-in to enforce across labs. Eventually could be unit/dept heads, but we’re not there yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies for Working with Communities of Color</td>
<td>URGE Pod participants are unaware of any existing for any labs or units at this time</td>
<td>Individual unit/lab heads should create their own Consider for VIMS institute-wide versions</td>
<td>Do not presently exist VIMS DiveIn &amp; W&amp;M Geo DEI Committee can serve to host examples from labs/units as they are developed</td>
<td>Once per year, more as needed</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unconscious bias training training focused on working with communities of color (something like this may exist at W&amp;M or could be modified in collaboration with W&amp;M Office of Diversity)</td>
<td>None; would require additional buy-in to enforce across labs. Eventually could be unit/dept heads, but we’re not there yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Hiring Policies</td>
<td>Clear policies exist for both, and reside with Human Resources and VIMS Admissions Committee. However, both can be updated to more explicitly consider JEDI issues</td>
<td>W&amp;M Human Resources VIMS Admissions Committee</td>
<td>W&amp;M Human Resources VIMS Admissions Committee</td>
<td>staggered: 1/yr early on and then less often once a suitable solution is found (this maybe)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unconscious bias in hiring training unconscious bias in hiring training for all VIMS advisors Instituted already for W&amp;M admissions, but may need updating</td>
<td>Admissions: Associate Dean of Academic Studies Hiring: W&amp;M/VIMS Human Resources and Diversity Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Plan</td>
<td>Resource Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • VIMS and W&M departments have mandatory initial lab safety training - does not include field or discriminatory safety  
• Principles of community for W&M and VIMS exist, but no requirement at other levels | • None exist  
• Individual unit/lab heads should create their own  
• Consider for VIMS institute-wide versions for inclusion in staff, student, and faculty handbooks; unit/lab versions could then reference back to institutional version |
| • VIMS safety office  
• W&M departments  
• W&M Environmental Health and Safety Department | • What we created is not true resource map.  
• [Here is a link to the Session 7 Deliverable](https://www.vims.edu/intranet/safety/programs/index.php), where we gathered lots of links to various resources.  
• This could be transformed into an actual resource map  
• VIMS DiveIn & W&M Geo DEI Committee can serve to host these as examples |
| • The policies are spread all over the W&M website - would be nice if all departmental safety plans were centrally located on EH&S’s site  
• VIMS - [https://www.vims.edu/intranet/safety/programs/index.php](https://www.vims.edu/intranet/safety/programs/index.php) | • Every year; resources are constantly changing  
• No, but it should include guidance on how this fits into other policies |
| • as needed; formally every year  
• All students, staff, faculty should review these plans every year  
• For the plans, every 5 years to see if plans need to change or added to | • None |
| • Yes, none of these plans include any aspect of discriminatory safety | • • Yes, people should have implicit bias and bystander training  
• Bystander training should be especially required if that person will be involved in field work  
• Lab and field safety training should absolutely be required upon arrival to the university followed up by a reminder online training every year |
| • Yes, the institution should have a record of who has or has not received the annual trainings/reminders to hold people accountable  
• For individual lab safety documents/plan, that should go through the department head, but accountability is necessary for individuals to formalize and put into practice the plans they create | • This doesn’t need formal channels. This could be implemented at any level |